

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Environment International



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/envint

Full length article

Outdoor air pollution and histologic composition of normal breast tissue

Jennifer L. Ish^a, Mustapha Abubakar^b, Shaoqi Fan^b, Rena R. Jones^b, Nicole M. Niehoff^a, Jill E. Henry^c, Gretchen L. Gierach^b, Alexandra J. White^{a,*}

^a Epidemiology Branch, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Durham, NC, USA

^b Occupational and Environmental Epidemiology Branch, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA

^c Biospecimen Collection and Banking Core, Susan G. Komen Tissue Bank at the IU Simon Comprehensive Cancer Center, Indianapolis, IN, USA

ARTICLE INFO	A B S T R A C T				
Handling Editor: Hanna Boogaard	Background: Biologic pathways underlying the association between outdoor air pollution and breast cancer risk				
Keywords: Air pollution Particulate matter Breast cancer K-means clustering	are poorly understood. Breast tissue composition may reflect cumulative exposure to breast cancer risk factors and has been associated with breast cancer risk among patients with benign breast disease. Herein, we evaluated whether fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) was associated with the histologic composition of normal breast tissue. <i>Methods</i> : Machine-learning algorithms were applied to digitized hematoxylin and eosin-stained biopsies of normal breast tissue to quantify the epithelium, stroma, adipose and total tissue area from 3,977 individuals aged 18–75 years from a primarily Midwestern United States population who donated breast tissue samples to the Susan G. Komen Tissue Bank (2009–2019). Annual levels of PM _{2.5} were assigned to each woman's residential address based on year of tissue donation. We applied predictive <i>k</i> -means to assign participants to clusters with similar PM _{2.5} chemical composition and used linear regression to examine the cross-sectional associations be- tween a 5-µg/m ³ increase in PM _{2.5} and square root-transformed proportions of epithelium, stroma, adipose, and epithelium-to-stroma proportion [ESP], overall and by PM _{2.5} cluster. <i>Results</i> : Higher residential PM _{2.5} was associated with lower proportion of breast stromal tissue [β = -0.93, 95% confidence interval: (-1.52, -0.33)], but was not related to the proportion of epithelium [β = -0.11 (-0.34, 0.11)]. Although PM _{2.5} was not associated with ESP overall [β = 0.24 (-0.16, 0.64)], the association significantly differed by PM _{2.5} chemical composition (<i>p</i> -interaction = 0.04), with a positive association evident only among an urban, Midwestern cluster with higher concentrations of nitrate (NO ₃) and ammonium (NH4) [β = 0.49 (0.03, 0.95)]. <i>Conclusions</i> : Our findings are consistent with a possible role of PM _{2.5} in breast cancer etiology and suggest that changes in breast tissue composition may be a potential pathway by which outdoor air pollution impacts breast cancer risk. This study further underscores the imp				

1. Background

Existing evidence suggests that exposure to ambient air pollution is associated with an increased risk of breast cancer. For example, nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), markers of traffic-related air pollution, have consistently been associated with elevated breast cancer risk (Cheng et al. 2020; Datzmann et al. 2018; Gabet et al. 2021; Niehoff et al. 2019; White et al. 2018). Studies of outdoor exposure to particulate matter <2.5 µm in diameter (PM_{2.5}) and breast cancer published prior to 2018 have reported largely null results (Andersen et al. 2017a; Andersen et al. 2017b; Hart et al. 2016; Reding et al. 2015). However, subsequent studies, including some that have considered geographic heterogeneity in the composition of $PM_{2.5}$, have observed evidence of a positive association (Villeneuve et al. 2018; White et al. 2021; White et al., 2019a). For example, higher exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ in two large, United States (US)-based prospective cohort studies was associated with a higher risk of breast cancer, with findings varying according to geographic region, suggesting that varying $PM_{2.5}$ chemical composition is an important consideration when evaluating the role of $PM_{2.5}$ in breast cancer (White et al. 2021; White et al., 2019a).

Studies of air pollution and breast density further support a role of air pollution in breast cancer etiology (DuPre et al. 2017; Huynh et al. 2015;

* Corresponding author at: 111 TW Alexander Dr A323, Durham NC 27709, USA.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2023.107984

Received 17 January 2023; Received in revised form 9 May 2023; Accepted 16 May 2023 Available online 19 May 2023

0160-4120/Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

E-mail addresses: jennifer.ish@nih.gov (J.L. Ish), mustapha.abubakar2@nih.gov (M. Abubakar), shaoqi.fan@nih.gov (S. Fan), rena.jones@nih.gov (R.R. Jones), nicole.niehoff@gmail.com (N.M. Niehoff), jihenry@iu.edu (J.E. Henry), gierachg@mail.nih.gov (G.L. Gierach), alexandra.white@nih.gov (A.J. White).

Yaghiyan et al. 2017). Increased mammographic breast density—a measure of the relative proportion of fibroglandular to adipose tissue in the breast-is a well-established breast cancer risk factor (Nazari and Mukherjee 2018). Among individuals who underwent mammography screening within the US Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium, those with dense breasts were more likely to have higher residential exposure to PM_{2.5} (Yaghiyan et al. 2017) and PAHs (White et al. 2019c). Additionally, our group previously found that residential PM_{2.5} may impact normal breast tissue characteristics through its association with reduced involution of terminal duct lobular units (TDLUs) (Niehoff et al. 2020), the epithelial structures where most breast cancers arise (Russo et al. 2000), and the reduction of which in benign breast biopsies has been associated with increased breast cancer risk (Figueroa et al. 2014; Milanese et al. 2006). Together these findings support the continued investigation of breast tissue composition to inform biologic pathways underlying the association between air pollution and breast cancer.

Emerging data suggest that the relative amount of fibroglandular tissue that is epithelium versus stroma may be an important contributing factor to breast cancer development (Abubakar et al. 2021; Vellal et al. 2021). Using novel machine learning-based methods, Abubakar et al. (2021) and Vellal et al. (2021) showed that among independent study populations of individuals with benign breast disease (BBD), the relative proportion or ratio of epithelium-to-stroma was associated with subsequent invasive breast cancer risk, suggesting that the interplay between epithelial and stromal tissue may create conditions that protect against or favor carcinogenesis (Abubakar et al. 2021; Vellal et al. 2021). Abubakar et al. (2023) also demonstrated that these same histologic features within the normal breast were related to established breast cancer risk factors, including obesity and breastfeeding. Hence, quantitative changes in breast tissue composition might constitute plausible intermediate markers of breast cancer risk that can be used to interrogate the potential biologic pathways underlying the associations between environmental exposures and breast cancer. In the present study, we evaluated how residential outdoor PM2.5 exposure is related to quantitative tissue composition metrics of the normal breast, with considerations of how associations vary according to PM2.5 chemical composition.

2. Methods

2.1. Study population

A total of 4,722 individuals enrolled in and donated breast tissue to the Susan G. Komen Tissue Bank-a biorepository of breast tissue donated by healthy volunteers-between 2009 and 2019 (htt ps://komentissuebank.iu.edu/). For participants who donated multiple samples, we considered the earliest instance of tissue donation. We excluded participants without available digitized images of hematoxylin and eosin-stained biopsies (n = 345), with a personal history of breast cancer (n = 163), who were pregnant or breastfeeding at the time of donation (n = 57), who did not have information on menopause status (n = 13) or who were 75 years of age or older (n = 43). We also excluded participants for whom we were unable to assign annual PM_{2.5} estimates (n = 66) either because they did not provide a donation address, or their donation address was not within the contiguous US. We also excluded participants who were missing covariate information used for adjustment in this study (n = 65). Thus, the final sample included in our analysis consisted of 3,977 participants.

At the time of tissue donation, enrollees completed a questionnaire that ascertained information about demographics, medical history, lifestyle factors, and reproductive history. The protocol was approved by the Indiana University Institutional Review Board. All participants provided written informed consent prior to enrollment.

2.2. Exposure assessment

We estimated annual levels of $PM_{2.5}$ at each participant's residential address corresponding to year of breast tissue donation using the US Environmental Protection Agency's Air Quality Time Series Project (EQUATES), a Bayesian space–time downscaling model that combines modeled air pollution levels from the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) Modeling System (version 5.3.2) with fixed site air pollution measurements from the National Air Monitoring Stations (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2021). Annual average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations, created by combining daily averages estimated at the 12 × 12 km grid level, were linked to participant's geocoded residential addresses corresponding to the respective year of tissue donation.

We also considered 2009 annual average concentrations of $PM_{2.5}$ component species sulfate (SO₄²), nitrate (NO₃), ammonium (NH₄⁺), elemental carbon (EC), and organic carbon (OC), which were estimated using CMAQ v5.3.2. These five components account for approximately 80% of PM_{2.5} total mass on average in the US, and the relative composition of PM_{2.5} components was stable across the 11-year study period (Bell et al. 2007).

2.3. Outcome assessment

The procedure for breast tissue collection involved the removal of up to four tissue cores from the left or right upper outer quadrant of the breast with a standard 9-gauge needle. One core was fixed in 10% buffered formalin or Paxgene, sectioned, and stained with hematoxylin and eosin (H&E). The stained tissue sections were then digitized at 20X magnification. Additional details are described by Figueroa et al. (2014). Next, machine-learning algorithms were applied to quantify histologic tissue composition. Briefly, a 85-datapoint tissue classifier script was trained by two pathologists with expertise in digital pathology and applied to digitized H&E-stained slide images to identify and quantify (in mm²) the area on each slide comprised of epithelium, stroma, and adipose tissue (Abubakar et al. 2023). The pathologists who performed the algorithm training and image analysis were blinded to all participant characteristics and used Halo Client computational pathology software (Indica Labs, Albuquerque, NM). Previous reproducibility analyses, in which another pathologist independently developed a script to analyze a subset of the images, showed excellent agreement for all three tissue types (Spearman's rho \geq 0.95). Additional details regarding the algorithm, training, and reproducibility are described in Abubakar et al. (2021) and Abubakar et al., (2023).

Percent epithelium, stroma, and adipose tissue area were calculated by dividing the absolute value of each histologic metric by total tissue area on the slide and multiplying by 100. We calculated an integrated measure of tissue characteristics, percent epithelial-to-stroma proportion (ESP), which was defined by dividing the epithelial area by total fibroglandular tissue area (i.e., epithelium and stroma) and multiplying by 100.

2.4. Statistical analysis

As in Niehoff et al. (2020), we identified groups of individuals with similar $PM_{2.5}$ component profiles using *K*-means clustering, an unsupervised algorithm that assigns observations in a dataset into a prespecified number of groups (*k*), such that within-cluster variation is minimized and between-cluster variation is maximized (Gibson et al. 2019). To determine the *k*-means clusters, we used the ratio of each component to $PM_{2.5}$ total mass. We identified the optimal number of clusters using two methods: 1) plotting the total within-cluster sum of squares according to number of clusters and determining at which point the plot "bends" (i.e., the "elbow method") and 2) by determining the number of clusters with the highest Rand Index, a measure of the

Table 1

Participant characteristics at breast tissue donation, overall and by PM_{2.5} component cluster, Komen Tissue Bank, 2009–2019.

n = 3,977)n = 2,860)n = 735)n = 376)Census region, n (%)327 (83.7%)2865 (100.0%)461 (62.7%)10.0%)Northeast111 (2.8%)10.0%)29 (3.9%)81 (21.5%)South260 (5.5%)0 (0%)29 (3.3%)15 (4.0%)West270 (7.0%)0 (0%)20 (5.5%)0 (0%)279 (7.4%)West270 (7.0%)0 (0%)0 (0%)279 (7.4%)Median [10,R]1.15 (5.6, 14.5]1.15 (6.8, 14.5)1.10 (5.6, 14.1)9.71 (6.1, 25.7)Age at domainmaccorthnicity, n (%)maccorthnicity, n (%)77 (10.5%)29 (7.7%)Non-Hispanic Black728 (18.3%)196 (6.6%)57 (75.8%)16.5 (4.3.9%)Non-Hispanic White278 (6.6.3%)196 (6.6.4%)27 (3.0.7%)88 (23.4%)Other196 (4.8%)196 (6.6.4%)21 (3.0.7%)81 (22.9%)Education, n (%)Hispanic100 (25.2%)680 (23.7%)218 (29.7%)103 (27.4%)Some college1001 (25.2%)680 (23.7%)128 (23.7%)121 (22.8%)Graduat degree or higher1010 (25.2%)74 (10.4%)126 (23.8%)126 (23.9%)Some college1001 (25.2%)620 (29.7%)103 (27.4%)126 (22.8%)Graduat degree or higher102 (25.4%)74 (10.4%)126 (22.8%)126 (22.8%)Graduat degree or higher102 (25.4%)74 (10.4%)136 (23.9%)126 (22.8%)Some college1001 (25.2%)62 (0.9%)10 (1.4%)82 (23.9%)Some college120 (2		Overall	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		(n = 3,977)	(n = 2,866)	(n = 735)	(n = 376)
Indiane3327 (83,7%)2865 (100,0%)461 (62,7%)1 (0.3%)Northeast11 (2.8%)1 (0.0%)245 (33,3%)81 (2.1.5%)South260 (6.5%)0 (0%)245 (33,3%)81 (2.1.5%)West279 (7.0%)0 (0%)246 (33,3%)15 (4.0%)West279 (7.0%)0 (0%)246 (33,3%)15 (4.0%)Median IDQNI1.1.5 [5.6, 14.5]1.1.5 [6.8, 14.5]11.0 [5.6, 14.1]9.71 [6.1, 12.5]Age at domation	Census region, n (%)				
Northeast 111 (2.8%) 1.0.0%) 29 (2.8%) Bit (2.1.8%) South 200 (0%) 0.0%) 279 (7.4.2%) 279 (7.4.2%) Median [1QN] 11.5 [5.6, 14.5] 11.5 [5.6, 14.5] 11.0 [5.6, 14.1] 9.71 [6.1, 12.5] Age at donation	Midwest	3327 (83.7%)	2865 (100.0%)	461 (62.7%)	1 (0.3%)
South200 (6.5%)0 (0%)245 (33.3%)15 (4.0%) 279 (7.4%)PM2.5 (ug/m ³)Median ID(RI)1.1.5 (5.6, 14.5]1.1.5 (6.8, 14.5]1.1.0 (5.6, 14.1]9.71 (6.1, 12.5] Age at domainMan (SD)4.3.8 (14.2)4.3.4 (14.0)1.1.0 (5.6, 14.4.7)4.5.5 (14.5%)Mace/ethnicity, n(%)Non-Hispanic Black728 (18.3%)622 (21.7%)77 (10.5%)97 (7.5%)Non-Hispanic White110 orbits336 (8.4%)174 (6.1%)74 (10.1%)88 (23.4%)OtherEducation, n(%)Hispanic OrlegeSanchelorsSanchelorsSanchelorsBodyBodyBodySanchelorsSanchelorsBodySanchelorsSanchelorsSanchelors.<	Northeast	111 (2.8%)	1 (0.0%)	29 (3.9%)	81 (21.5%)
Verset 279 (77,0%) $0.(0\%)$ 0.0% 279 (74,2%) Mdzs (ug/m ³)	South	260 (6.5%)	0 (0%)	245 (33.3%)	15 (4.0%)
\mathbf{PM}_{5} (sg/m ³) \mathbf{L} (S = 10, 10) \mathbf{L} (S = 10, 11, 12, 12, 13) Median [LQR] 1.1.5 [5.6, 14.5] 11.5 [6.8, 14.5] 11.0 [5.6, 14.1] 9.71 [6.1, 12.5] Median (DQ) 43.8 (14.2) 43.4 (14.0) 44.4 (14.7) 45.5 (14.5) Mace/ethnicity, n (%) Non-Hispanic Male 728 (18.3%) 622 (21.7%) 77 (10.5%) 29 (7.7%) Non-Hispanic White 278 (68.3%) 174 (6.1%) 74 (10.1%) 88 (23.4%) Other 135 (6.2.8%) 620 (23.7%) 218 (29.7%) 103 (27.4%) Bachelors 1306 (22.8%) 680 (23.7%) 218 (29.7%) 113 (22.2%) Body mass index (kg/m ²) 29.7 (7.7) 29.8 (7.8) 30.0 (7.6) 28.7 (7.2) Body mass index (kg/m ²) 132 (63.2%) 92 (27.6%) 193 (26.3%) 84 (23.4%) 12.5 to < 30	West	279 (7.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	279 (74.2%)
Median [100]11.5 [5.6, 14.5]11.5 [6.8, 14.5]11.0 [5.6, 14.1]9.71 [6.1, 12.5]Age at donation	$PM_{2} = (ug/m^3)$	_,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	- ()	• (• • •)	
Age at domationInterfact on the fact on	Median [IOR]	11.5 [5.6, 14.5]	11.5 [6.8, 14.5]	11.0 [5.6, 14.1]	9.71 [6.1, 12.5]
Name (1)43.8 (14.2)43.4 (14.0)44.4 (14.7)45.5 (14.5)Race/ethnicity, n (%)	Age at donation		[]		
Race/ethicity, n (%)InstitutionInstitutionNon-Hispanic Black728 (18.3%)622 (21.7%)77 (10.5%)29 (7.7%)Non-Hispanic White2718 (68.3%)196 (69.6%)557 (75.8%)156 (43.9%)Hispanic White336 (8.4%)174 (6.1%)74 (10.1%)88 (23.4%)Other195 (69.6%)72 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)Education, n (%)Hispanic 01 (25.2%)680 (23.7%)114 (29.7%)103 (27.4%)Bachelors1306 (32.8%)982 (34.3%)203 (27.6%)121 (32.2%)Graduate degree or higher1012 (25.4%)734 (25.6%)167 (22.7%)111 (29.5%)Body mass index (kg/m)Wean (SD)29.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)88.7 (7.2)< 1.8.5 to <25.0	Mean (SD)	43.8 (14.2)	43 4 (14 0)	44 4 (14 7)	45.5 (14.5)
Non-Hispanic Diack728 (18.3%)622 (21.7%)77 (10.5%)29 (7.7%)Non-Hispanic white2718 (68.3%)1996 (69.6%)557 (7.5%)165 (43.9%)Other195 (4.9%)74 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)Other195 (4.9%)74 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)Charles658 (16.5%)470 (16.4%)147 (20.0%)41 (10.9%)Some college1001 (25.2%)660 (23.7%)218 (29.7%)103 (27.4%)Bachelors1306 (32.8%)982 (34.3%)203 (27.6%)121 (32.2%)Graduate degree or higher1012 (25.4%)744 (25.6%)167 (22.7%)112 (32.3%)Body mass index (kg/m ³)29.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)28.7 (7.2)<18.5	Race/ethnicity, n (%)	1010 (1112)			1010 (1 110)
Non-Hispanic white2718 (68.3%)1996 (69.6%)557 (75.8%)165 (43.9%)Hispanic336 (8.4%)174 (6.1%)74 (10.1%)88 (23.4%)Other196 (4.9%)74 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)Education, n (%) </td <td>Non-Hispanic Black</td> <td>728 (18.3%)</td> <td>622 (21.7%)</td> <td>77 (10.5%)</td> <td>29 (7.7%)</td>	Non-Hispanic Black	728 (18.3%)	622 (21.7%)	77 (10.5%)	29 (7.7%)
Hispanic336 (8.4%)174 (6.1%)74 (10.1%)88 (23.4%)Other195 (4.9%)74 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)Other195 (4.9%)74 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)High school or less658 (16.5%)470 (16.4%)147 (20.0%)41 (10.9%)Some college100 (25.2%)650 (23.7%)218 (29.7%)103 (27.4%)Bachelors1306 (32.8%)982 (34.3%)203 (27.6%)121 (32.2%)Graduate degree or higher1012 (25.4%)734 (25.6%)100 (1.4%)8 (2.1%)Body mass index (kg/m²)29.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)8.7 (7.2)Mean (SD)29.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)8.6 (2.3%)25.0 to < 30	Non-Hispanic white	2718 (68.3%)	1996 (69.6%)	557 (75.8%)	165 (43.9%)
Instant195 (4.9%)74 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)Education, n (%)1195 (4.9%)74 (2.6%)27 (3.7%)94 (25.0%)Education, n (%)110.9%)141 (10.9%)141 (10.9%)Some college1001 (25.2%)680 (23.7%)218 (29.7%)103 (27.4%)Bachelors1306 (32.8%)982 (43.3%)203 (27.6%)121 (32.2%)Graduate degree or higher1012 (25.4%)734 (25.6%)167 (22.7%)111 (29.5%)Body mass index (kg/m ³)930 (37.6%)26 (0.9%)10 (1.4%)8 (2.1%)Bas to < 25.0	Hispanic	336 (8.4%)	174 (6 1%)	74 (10 1%)	88 (23.4%)
Education, $n(9_0)$ FreedowFreedowFreedowFreedowHigh school or less $658 (16.5\%)$ $470 (16.4\%)$ $147 (20.0\%)$ $41 (10.9\%)$ Some college $1001 (25.2\%)$ $660 (23.7\%)$ $218 (29.7\%)$ $121 (32.2\%)$ Bachelons $1306 (32.8\%)$ $982 (34.3\%)$ $203 (72.6\%)$ $121 (32.2\%)$ Graduate degree or higher $1012 (25.4\%)$ $734 (25.6\%)$ $167 (22.7\%)$ $111 (29.5\%)$ Body mass index (kg/m ²) W W W $S7 (7.2)$ $218 (30.7\%)$ $82.7 (7.2)$ (18.5) $29.7 (7.7)$ $29.8 (7.8)$ $30.0 (7.6)$ $28.7 (7.2)$ (218.5) 44.11% $26 (0.9\%)$ $10 (1.4\%)$ $82 (2.1\%)$ 18.5 to < 25.0 $1208 (30.4\%)$ $874 (30.5\%)$ $198 (26.9\%)$ $136 (36.2\%)$ 25.0 to < 30 $1656 (41.6\%)$ $1774 (41.0\%)$ $334 (45.4\%)$ $148 (39.4\%)$ Smoking status, $n(%)$ Never W W W Never $230 (73.7\%)$ $2166 (73.5\%)$ $542 (73.7\%)$ $282 (75.0\%)$ Former $817 (20.5\%)$ $595 (20.8\%)$ $144 (19.6\%)$ $78 (20.7\%)$ Current $230 (58.9\%)$ $236 (57.6\%)$ $338 (59.6\%)$ $236 (62.8\%)$ Postmenopausal $2510 (55.6\%)$ $1936 (67.6\%)$ $438 (59.6\%)$ $236 (62.8\%)$ Urban $357 (89.9\%)$ $261 (92.5\%)$ $550 (74.8\%)$ $373 (9.2\%)$ Urban $357 (89.9\%)$ $261 (92.5\%)$ $50 (74.8\%)$ $373 (9.2\%)$ Urban $357 (89.9\%)$ $261 (92.5\%)$ $50 (74.$	Other	195 (4.9%)	74 (2.6%)	27 (3.7%)	94 (25.0%)
High school or less658 (16.5%)470 (16.4%)147 (20.0%)41 (10.9%)Some college1001 (25.2%)680 (23.7%)218 (29.7%)103 (27.4%)Bachelors1306 (32.8%)952 (43.3%)203 (27.6%)121 (32.2%)Body mass index (kg/m²)1112 (25.4%)734 (25.6%)167 (22.7%)111 (29.5%)Body mass index (kg/m²)29.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)28.7 (7.2)< 18.5	Education, n (%)	150 (11570)	, T (21070)	27 (01770)	51 (201070)
large instantionloon (25.2%) is (22.7%)for (23.7%) is (22.7%)103 (27.4%) is (22.7%)Bachelors100 (25.2%)982 (34.3%)203 (27.6%)121 (32.2%) is (22.7%)Bachelors101 (25.4%)734 (25.6%)167 (22.7%)111 (29.5%)Body mass index (kg/m ²) </td <td>High school or less</td> <td>658 (16 5%)</td> <td>470 (16 4%)</td> <td>147 (20.0%)</td> <td>41 (10.9%)</td>	High school or less	658 (16 5%)	470 (16 4%)	147 (20.0%)	41 (10.9%)
Bachelors1306 (32.8%)982 (34.3%)203 (27.6%)121 (32.2%)Graduate degree or higher1012 (25.4%)734 (25.6%)107 (22.7%)111 (29.5%)Body mass index (kg/m)29.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)28.7 (7.2)< 18.5	Some college	1001 (25.2%)	680 (23.7%)	218 (29.7%)	103 (27.4%)
Graduat degree or higher1012 (25.4%)734 (25.6%)167 (22.7%)111 (29.5%)Body mass index (kg/m ²)734 (25.6%)167 (22.7%)111 (29.5%)Body mass index (kg/m ²)99.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)28.7 (7.2)8.544 (1.1%)26 (0.9%)10 (1.4%)8 (2.1%)18.5 to < 25.01208 (30.4%)874 (30.5%)198 (26.9%)136 (36.2%)25.0 to < 301069 (26.9%)792 (27.6%)139 (26.3%)84 (22.3%)≥ 30165 (41.6%)1174 (41.0%)334 (45.4%)148 (39.4%)Smoking status, n (%)VVVNever2930 (73.7%)2106 (73.5%)542 (73.7%)282 (75.0%)Current230 (58.8%)156 (58.8%)49 (6.7%)48 (59.6%)236 (62.8%)Premenopausal1367 (34.4%)930 (32.4%)297 (40.4%)140 (37.2%)Dysimenopausal1367 (34.4%)930 (32.4%)297 (40.4%)140 (37.2%)Urban387 (9.7%)204 (7.1%)181 (24.6%)20.6%)Suburban387 (9.7%)204 (7.1%)181 (24.6%)20.6%)Suburban387 (9.7%)204 (7.1%)181 (24.6%)20.6%)25 to ≤ 50%550 (74.8%)30 (8.0%)20.7%)Suburban387 (9.7%)204 (7.1%)181 (24.6%)20.6%)Suburban387 (9.7%)204 (7.1%)181 (24.6%)20.6%)O 5 2 55%250 (6.3%)190 (6.6%)30 (4.1%)30 (8.0%)Suburban387 (9.7%)193 (13.5%)19 (Bachelors	1306 (32.8%)	982 (34.3%)	203 (27.6%)	121 (32.2%)
Solution Cognet CognetFor (20.7%)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)28.7 (7.2)Mean (SD)29.7 (7.7)29.8 (7.8)30.0 (7.6)28.7 (7.2)<18.5	Graduate degree or higher	1012 (25.4%)	734 (25.6%)	167 (22 7%)	111 (29.5%)
Note that the set of the	Body mass index (kg/m^2)	1012 (20.170)	701 (20.070)	107 (22.770)	111 (20.070)
Interm (DS)2.50 (17)2.50 (10)5.05 (17)2.50 (10)218.5218.5250 (12)260 (09)198 (26.9%)136 (36.2%)25.0 to < 30	Mean (SD)	29 7 (7 7)	29.8 (7.8)	30.0 (7.6)	287(72)
C 10.5 C 10.5 C 10.5T (11.10) C 10.170)D (11.10) C 10.170)D (11.10) C 10.170)D (11.10) C 10.170)18.5 to < 25.0 2 301069 (26.9%)792 (27.6%)193 (26.3%)84 (22.3%) \geq 301656 (41.6%)1174 (41.0%)334 (45.4%)148 (39.4%)Smoking status, n (%) </td <td>< 18 5</td> <td>20.7 (7.7) 44 (1.1%)</td> <td>25.0 (7.0)</td> <td>10 (1.4%)</td> <td>8 (2 1%)</td>	< 18 5	20.7 (7.7) 44 (1.1%)	25.0 (7.0)	10 (1.4%)	8 (2 1%)
10.5 2.50 to < 3010.60 (26.9%)792 (27.6%)193 (26.3%)84 (22.3%)≥ 301656 (41.6%)1174 (41.0%)334 (45.4%)148 (39.4%)Smoking status, n (%)Never2930 (73.7%)2106 (73.5%)542 (73.7%)282 (75.0%)Former817 (20.5%)595 (20.8%)144 (19.6%)78 (20.7%)Current230 (5.8%)195 (5.8%)49 (6.7%)16 (4.3%)Menopause status, n (%) </td <td>18.5 to < 25.0</td> <td>1208 (30.4%)</td> <td>874 (30 5%)</td> <td>198 (26 9%)</td> <td>136 (36 2%)</td>	18.5 to < 25.0	1208 (30.4%)	874 (30 5%)	198 (26 9%)	136 (36 2%)
Los (So105 (Los (S)174 (L1,0%)334 (45,4%)148 (39,4%)Smoking status, n (%)1174 (41.0%)334 (45,4%)148 (39,4%)Never2930 (73,7%)2106 (73,5%)542 (73,7%)282 (75,0%)Current230 (5.8%)155 (5.8%)49 (6.7%)16 (4.3%)Menopause status, n (%) </td <td>25.0 to < 30</td> <td>1069 (26.9%)</td> <td>792 (27.6%)</td> <td>193 (26.3%)</td> <td>84 (22 3%)</td>	25.0 to < 30	1069 (26.9%)	792 (27.6%)	193 (26.3%)	84 (22 3%)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	> 30	1656 (41.6%)	1174 (41 0%)	334 (45 4%)	148 (39.4%)
Detecting barries2930 (73.7%)2106 (73.5%)542 (73.7%)282 (75.0%)Former817 (20.5%)595 (20.8%)144 (19.6%)78 (20.7%)Current230 (5.8%)165 (5.8%)194 (5.7%)16 (4.3%)Menopause status, n (%) </td <td>Smoking status n (%)</td> <td>1000 (11.070)</td> <td>11/1 (11.070)</td> <td>301 (10.170)</td> <td>110 (05.170)</td>	Smoking status n (%)	1000 (11.070)	11/1 (11.070)	301 (10.170)	110 (05.170)
Netch2500 (0.5.%)2100 (0.5.%)512 (0.5.%)252 (0.5.%)Former817 (20.5%)505 (0.5.%)144 (19.6%)78 (20.7%)Current230 (5.8%)165 (5.8%)49 (6.7%)16 (4.3%)Menopause status, n (%) </td <td>Never</td> <td>2930 (73 7%)</td> <td>2106 (73 5%)</td> <td>542 (73 7%)</td> <td>282 (75.0%)</td>	Never	2930 (73 7%)	2106 (73 5%)	542 (73 7%)	282 (75.0%)
NumberDiff (20.5%) (20.5%)Diff (20.5%) (20.5%)Diff (20.5%) (20.5%)Diff (20.5%) 	Former	2000 (70.7%) 817 (20.5%)	595 (20.8%)	144 (19.6%)	78 (20 7%)
ContractLos (0.5.%)For (0.5.%)For (0.5.%)For (0.5.%)Premenopause2610 (65.6%)1936 (67.6%)438 (59.6%)236 (62.8%)Postmenopausal1367 (34.4%)930 (32.4%)297 (40.4%)140 (37.2%)Urban3574 (89.9%)2651 (92.5%)550 (74.8%)373 (99.2%)Suburban387 (9.7%)204 (7.1%)181 (24.6%)2 (0.5%)Rural16 (0.4%)11 (0.4%)4 (0.5%)1 (0.3%)Percent fat on the slide, n (%)0030 (4.1%)30 (8.0%)0 to $\leq 25\%$ 500 (5.3%)190 (6.6%)30 (4.1%)30 (8.0%)> 25 to $\leq 50\%$ 502 (12.6%)393 (13.7%)67 (9.1%)42 (11.2%)> 50 to $\leq 75\%$ 887 (22.3%)679 (23.7%)136 (18.5%)72 (19.1%)> 75-100%2338 (58.8%)1604 (56.0%)502 (68.3%)232 (61.7%)2009353 (8.9%)319 (11.1%)34 (4.6%)0 (0%)2010360 (9.1%)329 (11.5%)31 (4.2%)0 (0%)2011483 (12.1%)321 (11.2%)159 (21.6%)3 (0.8%)2012997 (25.1%)837 (29.2%)156 (21.2%)4 (1.1%)2013387 (9.7%)193 (6.7%)12 (1.6%)182 (48.4%)2014406 (10.2%)385 (13.4%)21 (2.9%)0 (0%)2015231 (5.8%)76 (2.7%)136 (18.5%)19 (5.1%)2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1 (0.3%)2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1 (0.3%)	Current	230 (5.8%)	165 (5.8%)	49 (6 7%)	16 (4 3%)
Interprete function of the second	Menonause status n (%)	200 (0.070)	100 (01070)	19 (01/70)	10 (11070)
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } let (1.5) let (1.$	Premenonausal	2610 (65.6%)	1936 (67.6%)	438 (59.6%)	236 (62.8%)
FormulationFor (SF110)So (SE110)Ex (N110)For (N110)Urbanicity, n (%)Urban $3574 (89.9\%)$ $2651 (92.5\%)$ $550 (74.8\%)$ $373 (99.2\%)$ Suburban $387 (9.7\%)$ $204 (7.1\%)$ $181 (24.6\%)$ $2 (0.5\%)$ Rural $16 (0.4\%)$ $11 (0.4\%)$ $4 (0.5\%)$ $1 (0.3\%)$ Percent fat on the slide, n (%) 0 $0 (6.6\%)$ $30 (4.1\%)$ $30 (8.0\%)$ 0 to $\leq 25\%$ $502 (12.6\%)$ $393 (13.7\%)$ $67 (9.1\%)$ $42 (11.2\%)$ $> 25 to \leq 50\%502 (12.6\%)393 (13.7\%)67 (9.1\%)42 (11.2\%)> 50 to \leq 75\%887 (22.3\%)679 (23.7\%)136 (18.5\%)72 (19.1\%)> 75-100\%2338 (58.8\%)1604 (56.0\%)502 (68.3\%)232 (61.7\%)2009353 (8.9\%)319 (11.1\%)34 (4.6\%)0 (0\%)2010360 (9.1\%)329 (11.5\%)31 (4.2\%)0 (0\%)2011483 (12.1\%)321 (11.2\%)156 (21.2\%)4 (1.1\%)2013387 (9.7\%)193 (6.7\%)12 (1.6\%)182 (48.4\%)2014406 (10.2\%)385 (13.4\%)21 (2.9\%)0 (0\%)2015231 (5.8\%)76 (2.7\%)136 (18.5\%)19 (5.1\%)2016400 (10.1\%)251 (8.8\%)148 (20.1\%)10 (3\%)2017193 (4.9\%)84 (2.9\%)27 (3.7\%)82 (21.8\%)2018218 (3.2\%)38 (1.3\%)5 (0.7\%)82 (21.8\%)2019$	Postmenopausal	1367 (34.4%)	930 (32 4%)	297 (40 4%)	140 (37.2%)
Solution (1) if (10)Urban $3574 (89.9\%)$ $2651 (92.5\%)$ $550 (74.8\%)$ $373 (99.2\%)$ Suburban $387 (9.7\%)$ $204 (7.1\%)$ $181 (24.6\%)$ $2 (0.5\%)$ Rural $16 (0.4\%)$ $11 (0.4\%)$ $4 (0.5\%)$ $1 (0.3\%)$ Percent fat on the slide, n (%)0 to $\leq 25\%$ $250 (6.3\%)$ $190 (6.6\%)$ $30 (4.1\%)$ $30 (8.0\%)$ > $25 to \leq 50\%$ $502 (12.6\%)$ $393 (13.7\%)$ $67 (9.1\%)$ $42 (11.2\%)$ > $55 to \leq 75\%$ $887 (22.3\%)$ $679 (23.7\%)$ $136 (18.5\%)$ $72 (19.1\%)$ > $75-100\%$ $2338 (58.8\%)$ $1604 (56.0\%)$ $502 (68.3\%)$ $232 (61.7\%)$ Vear of donation, n (%)Vear of donation, n (%)2009 $553 (8.9\%)$ $319 (11.1\%)$ $34 (4.6\%)$ $0 (0\%)$ 2010 $360 (9.1\%)$ $321 (11.2\%)$ $159 (21.6\%)$ $3 (0.8\%)$ 2011 $483 (12.1\%)$ $321 (11.2\%)$ $159 (21.6\%)$ $4 (1.1\%)$ 2013 $387 (9.7\%)$ $193 (6.7\%)$ $12 (1.6\%)$ $182 (48.4\%)$ 2014 $406 (10.2\%)$ $385 (13.4\%)$ $21 (2.9\%)$ $0 (0\%)$ 2015 $231 (5.8\%)$ $76 (2.7\%)$ $136 (18.5\%)$ $19 (5.1\%)$ 2016 $400 (10.1\%)$ $251 (8.8\%)$ $148 (20.1\%)$ $10 (0.3\%)$ 2017 $193 (4.9\%)$ $84 (2.9\%)$ $27 (3.7\%)$ $82 (21.8\%)$ 2018 $228 (3.2\%)$ $38 (1.3\%)$ $5 (0.7\%)$ $85 (22.6\%)$ 2019 $39 (1.0\%)$ $33 (1.2\%)$ <td>Urbanicity n (%)</td> <td>1007 (01.170)</td> <td>500 (02.170)</td> <td>257 (10.170)</td> <td>110 (07.270)</td>	Urbanicity n (%)	1007 (01.170)	500 (02.170)	257 (10.170)	110 (07.270)
Orbit387 (9.7%)204 (7.1%)181 (24.6%)2 (0.5%)Rural16 (0.4%)11 (0.4%)4 (0.5%)1 (0.3%)Percent fat on the slide, n (%) 0 0 0 0 0 to $\leq 25\%$ 250 (6.3%)190 (6.6%)30 (4.1%)30 (8.0%)> 25 to $\leq 50\%$ 502 (12.6%)393 (13.7%)67 (9.1%)42 (11.2%)> 50 to $\leq 75\%$ 887 (22.3%)679 (23.7%)136 (18.5%)72 (19.1%)> 75-100%2338 (58.8%)1604 (56.0%)502 (68.3%)232 (61.7%)Vear of donation, n (%)Year of donation, n (%)2009353 (8.9%)319 (11.1%)34 (4.6%)0 (0%)2011483 (12.1%)329 (11.5%)31 (4.2%)0 (0%)2012997 (25.1%)837 (29.2%)156 (21.2%)4 (1.1%)2013387 (9.7%)193 (6.7%)12 (1.6%)182 (48.4%)2014406 (10.2%)385 (13.4%)21 (2.9%)0 (0%)2015231 (5.8%)76 (2.7%)136 (18.5%)19 (5.1%)2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1(0.3%)2017193 (4.9%)84 (2.9%)27 (3.7%)82 (21.8%)2018128 (3.2%)38 (1.3%)5 (0.7%)85 (22.6%)201939 (1.0%)33 (1.2%)6 (0.8%)0 (0%)	Urban	3574 (89.9%)	2651 (92 5%)	550 (74.8%)	373 (99.2%)
Solution16 (0.1%)16 (0.1%)16 (0.1%)16 (0.1%)1 (0.3%)Percent fat on the slide, n (%)11 (0.4%)4 (0.5%)1 (0.3%)0 to $\leq 25\%$ 250 (6.3%)190 (6.6%)30 (4.1%)30 (8.0%)> 25 to $\leq 50\%$ 502 (12.6%)393 (13.7%)67 (9.1%)42 (11.2%)> 50 to $\leq 75\%$ 887 (22.3%)679 (23.7%)136 (18.5%)72 (19.1%)> 75-100%2338 (58.8%)1604 (56.0%)502 (68.3%)232 (61.7%)Year of donation, n (%)YYear of donation, n (%)2009353 (8.9%)319 (11.1%)34 (4.6%)0 (0%)2010360 (9.1%)329 (11.5%)31 (4.2%)0 (0%)2011483 (12.1%)321 (11.2%)159 (21.6%)3 (0.8%)2012997 (25.1%)837 (29.2%)156 (21.2%)4 (1.1%)2013387 (9.7%)193 (6.7%)12 (1.6%)182 (48.4%)2014406 (10.2%)385 (13.4%)21 (2.9%)0 (0%)2015231 (5.8%)76 (2.7%)136 (18.5%)19 (5.1%)2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1 (0.3%)2017193 (4.9%)84 (2.9%)27 (3.7%)82 (21.8%)2018128 (3.2%)38 (1.3%)5 (0.7%)85 (22.6%)201939 (1.0%)33 (1.2%)6 (0.8%)0 (0%)	Suburban	387 (9.7%)	2031 (52.376)	181 (24.6%)	2 (0 5%)
NameFor the slide, n (%)For the slide, n (%)For the slide, n (%)0 to $\leq 25\%$ 250 (6.3%)190 (6.6%)30 (4.1%)30 (8.0%)> 25 to $\leq 50\%$ 502 (12.6%)393 (13.7%)67 (9.1%)42 (11.2%)> 50 to $\leq 75\%$ 887 (22.3%)679 (23.7%)136 (18.5%)72 (19.1%)> 75-100%2338 (58.8%)1604 (56.0%)502 (68.3%)232 (61.7%)Year of donation, n (%)Year of donation, n (%)Year of donation, n (%)2009353 (8.9%)319 (11.1%)34 (4.6%)0 (0%)2010360 (9.1%)329 (11.5%)31 (4.2%)0 (0%)2011483 (12.1%)321 (11.2%)159 (21.6%)3 (0.8%)2012997 (25.1%)837 (29.2%)156 (21.2%)4 (1.1%)2013387 (9.7%)193 (6.7%)12 (1.6%)182 (48.4%)2014406 (10.2%)385 (13.4%)21 (2.9%)0 (0%)2015231 (5.8%)76 (2.7%)136 (18.5%)19 (5.1%)2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1 (0.3%)2017193 (4.9%)84 (2.9%)27 (3.7%)82 (21.8%)2018128 (3.2%)38 (1.3%)5 (0.7%)85 (22.6%)201939 (1.0%)33 (1.2%)6 (0.8%)0 (0%)	Bural	16 (0.4%)	11 (0.4%)	4 (0 5%)	1(0.3%)
Note that is interval 0 to $\leq 25\%$ 250 (6.3%) 190 (6.6%) 30 (4.1%) 30 (8.0%) > 25 to $\leq 50\%$ 502 (12.6%) 393 (13.7%) 67 (9.1%) 42 (11.2%) > 50 to $\leq 75\%$ 887 (22.3%) 679 (23.7%) 136 (18.5%) 72 (19.1%) $> 75-100\%$ 2338 (58.8%) 1604 (56.0%) 502 (68.3%) 232 (61.7%)Year of donation, n (%)V2009 353 (8.9%) 319 (11.1%) 34 (4.6%) 0 (0%) 2010 360 (9.1%) 329 (11.5%) 31 (4.2%) 0 (0%) 2011 483 (12.1%) 321 (11.2%) 159 (21.6%) 3 (0.8%) 2012 997 (25.1%) 837 (29.2%) 156 (21.2%) 4 (1.1%) 2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1 (0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	Percent fat on the slide n (%)	10 (0.170)	11 (0.170)	1 (0.070)	1 (0.070)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	0 to < 25%	250 (6 3%)	190 (6.6%)	30 (4 1%)	30 (8 0%)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$> 25 \text{ to } \le 50\%$	502 (12 6%)	393 (13 7%)	67 (9.1%)	42 (11 2%)
$\begin{array}{c} 70.61 \pm 70.61 \\ > 75-100\% \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 2338 (58.8\%) \\ 2338 (58.8\%) \\ 1604 (56.0\%) \\ 502 (68.3\%) \\ 232 (61.7\%) \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 72 (13.11\%) \\ 232 (61.7\%) \\ 232 (61.7\%) \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \bigg $ \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \bigg \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \bigg \\ \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggl \bigg \\ \Biggr \\ \bigg \\ \\	$> 50 \text{ to } \le 75\%$	887 (22.3%)	679 (23 7%)	136 (18 5%)	72 (19.1%)
Year of donation, n (%) Zebs (200, 36, 9) 319 (11.1%) 342 (200, 36, 9) 200 (00, 0) 2009 353 (8,9%) 319 (11.1%) 34 (4.6%) 0 (0%) 2010 360 (9,1%) 329 (11.5%) 31 (4.2%) 0 (0%) 2011 483 (12.1%) 321 (11.2%) 159 (21.6%) 3 (0.8%) 2012 997 (25.1%) 837 (29.2%) 156 (21.2%) 4 (1.1%) 2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1 (0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	> 75-100%	2338 (58.8%)	1604 (56 0%)	502 (68 3%)	232 (61 7%)
Year of donation, n (%) Year of donation, n (%) 2009 353 (8.9%) 319 (11.1%) 34 (4.6%) 0 (0%) 2010 360 (9.1%) 329 (11.5%) 31 (4.2%) 0 (0%) 2011 483 (12.1%) 321 (11.2%) 159 (21.6%) 3 (0.8%) 2012 997 (25.1%) 837 (29.2%) 156 (21.2%) 4 (1.1%) 2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1(0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	//3-100/0	2000 (00.070)	1004 (30.070)	302 (00.370)	202 (01.770)
Year of donation, n (%) 2009 353 (8.9%) 319 (11.1%) 34 (4.6%) 0 (0%) 2010 360 (9.1%) 329 (11.5%) 31 (4.2%) 0 (0%) 2011 483 (12.1%) 321 (11.2%) 159 (21.6%) 3 (0.8%) 2012 997 (25.1%) 837 (29.2%) 156 (21.2%) 4 (1.1%) 2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1(0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)					
2009 353 (8.9%) 319 (11.1%) 34 (4.6%) 0 (0%) 2010 360 (9.1%) 329 (11.5%) 31 (4.2%) 0 (0%) 2011 483 (12.1%) 321 (11.2%) 159 (21.6%) 3 (0.8%) 2012 997 (25.1%) 837 (29.2%) 156 (21.2%) 4(1.1%) 2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 21 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1(0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	Year of donation, n (%)				
2010 360 (9.1%) 329 (11.5%) 31 (4.2%) 0 (0%) 2011 483 (12.1%) 321 (11.2%) 159 (21.6%) 3 (0.8%) 2012 997 (25.1%) 837 (29.2%) 156 (21.2%) 4 (1.1%) 2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1 (0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	2009	353 (8.9%)	319 (11.1%)	34 (4.6%)	0 (0%)
2011483 (12.1%)321 (11.2%)159 (21.6%)3 (0.8%)2012997 (25.1%)837 (29.2%)156 (21.2%)4 (1.1%)2013387 (9.7%)193 (6.7%)12 (1.6%)182 (48.4%)2014406 (10.2%)385 (13.4%)21 (2.9%)0 (0%)2015231 (5.8%)76 (2.7%)136 (18.5%)19 (5.1%)2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1 (0.3%)2017193 (4.9%)84 (2.9%)27 (3.7%)82 (21.8%)2018128 (3.2%)38 (1.3%)5 (0.7%)85 (22.6%)201939 (1.0%)33 (1.2%)6 (0.8%)0 (0%)	2010	360 (9.1%)	329 (11.5%)	31 (4.2%)	0 (0%)
2012 997 (25.1%) 837 (29.2%) 156 (21.2%) 4 (1.1%) 2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1 (0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	2011	483 (12.1%)	321 (11.2%)	159 (21.6%)	3 (0.8%)
2013 387 (9.7%) 193 (6.7%) 12 (1.6%) 182 (48.4%) 2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1 (0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	2012	997 (25.1%)	837 (29.2%)	156 (21.2%)	4 (1.1%)
2014 406 (10.2%) 385 (13.4%) 21 (2.9%) 0 (0%) 2015 231 (5.8%) 76 (2.7%) 136 (18.5%) 19 (5.1%) 2016 400 (10.1%) 251 (8.8%) 148 (20.1%) 1 (0.3%) 2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	2013	387 (9.7%)	193 (6.7%)	12 (1.6%)	182 (48.4%)
2015231 (5.8%)76 (2.7%)136 (18.5%)19 (5.1%)2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1 (0.3%)2017193 (4.9%)84 (2.9%)27 (3.7%)82 (21.8%)2018128 (3.2%)38 (1.3%)5 (0.7%)85 (22.6%)201939 (1.0%)33 (1.2%)6 (0.8%)0 (0%)	2014	406 (10.2%)	385 (13.4%)	21 (2.9%)	0 (0%)
2016400 (10.1%)251 (8.8%)148 (20.1%)1 (0.3%)2017193 (4.9%)84 (2.9%)27 (3.7%)82 (21.8%)2018128 (3.2%)38 (1.3%)5 (0.7%)85 (22.6%)201939 (1.0%)33 (1.2%)6 (0.8%)0 (0%)	2015	231 (5.8%)	76 (2.7%)	136 (18.5%)	19 (5.1%)
2017 193 (4.9%) 84 (2.9%) 27 (3.7%) 82 (21.8%) 2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	2016	400 (10.1%)	251 (8.8%)	148 (20.1%)	1 (0.3%)
2018 128 (3.2%) 38 (1.3%) 5 (0.7%) 85 (22.6%) 2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	2017	193 (4.9%)	84 (2.9%)	27 (3.7%)	82 (21.8%)
2019 39 (1.0%) 33 (1.2%) 6 (0.8%) 0 (0%)	2018	128 (3.2%)	38 (1.3%)	5 (0.7%)	85 (22.6%)
	2019	39 (1.0%)	33 (1.2%)	6 (0.8%)	0 (0%)

robustness of the clustering algorithm to variability within the population (Hubert and Arabie 1985). Both methods indicated the optimal number of clusters as three.

We evaluated the distribution of participant characteristics, geographic variability, and annual $PM_{2.5}$ exposure overall and by $PM_{2.5}$ component clusters. We used linear regression to model coefficients (β) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the association between a 5- μ g/m³ increase in annual $PM_{2.5}$ total mass concentrations and each tissue composition metric. We applied a square root transformation to tissue composition metrics (i.e., %ESP, %epithelium, %stroma, and %adipose tissue) in order to improve approximate homoskedasticity and normality of model residuals. Thus, the effect estimates can be interpreted as the association between a 5- μ g/m³ increase in annual $PM_{2.5}$ total mass concentrations and the square root-transformed proportion of epithelium, stroma, adipose, epithelial-to-stromal proportion. We also

explored associations between concentrations of each $PM_{2.5}$ component species and each tissue metric.

To identify potential confounders, we created a directed acyclic graph (DAG) based on previous literature (Greenland et al. 1999). Our adjustment set included the following variables: age at donation (years), smoking status (never, former, current), education (high school graduate or less, vocational/technical/associate degree, college degree, graduate/professional degree), self-identified race/ethnicity (Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic white, other [Asian, Native American/Alaskan, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, other, or unknown]), body mass index (BMI, kg/m²), US census region (Midwest, Northeast, South, or West) and donation year. For models of epithelium-to-stroma proportion (ESP), we additionally adjusted for the percent adipose tissue on the slide.

Comparing models with and without cross-product terms and using a

likelihood-ratio test, we considered whether associations varied by PM_{2.5} component cluster assignment and menopause status. Individuals were classified as postmenopausal (n = 1,367) if they reported any of the following: did not have a menstrual period in the 12 months prior to tissue donation, had a bilateral oophorectomy, had a hysterectomy without a bilateral oophorectomy and were \geq 55 years of age, or had a uterine ablation and were \geq 55 years of age.

In sensitivity analyses, we explored overall and cluster-specific associations with average 2009 $PM_{2.5}$ total mass concentrations assigned to all participants rather annual concentration based on participants' donation year. We also explored whether associations differed according to BMI categories and parity using the same methods described in the paragraph above and considered additional adjustment for area-level factors (i.e., census tract-level income and urbanicity; n = 1 missing) and for reproductive history (i.e., parity and breastfeeding; n = 169 missing). Lastly, to rule out any potential influence of cigarette smoking in observed associations, we restricted the analysis to participants who reported never smoking cigarettes. All analyses were carried out using R version 4.2.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

3. Results

The demographic characteristics of participants at the time of tissue donation are summarized in Table 1. Participants were, on average, about 44 years of age. Approximately 18% and 68% were non-Hispanic Black and non-Hispanic White, respectively. The majority of participants had at least a college degree (58%), were overweight or obese (69%), had never smoked cigarettes (73%), and were premenopausal (66%). While the residential locations of participants represent all four US census regions of the contiguous US, most resided in the Midwest (84%) which is reflective of the location of most tissue collection events. The distribution of each tissue metric is presented in Supplemental Table 1. Briefly, breast tissue samples were largely comprised of adipose tissue (81%), followed by stroma (17%) and epithelium (1%). ESP had a moderate to low correlation with individual tissue metrics (r = -0.14 to 0.57; Supplemental Table 1).

The average annual residential level of $PM_{2.5}$ was 11.5 $\mu g/m^2$

(interquartile range [IQR] = 5.59, 14.5). We identified three clusters of participants with similar profiles of PM_{2.5} chemical composition (Fig. 1). The relative contributions of each component species to PM_{2.5} total mass within each cluster are described in Fig. 2. Clusters 1 (n = 2,966) and 2 (n = 376) had similar levels of residential exposure to PM_{2.5} total mass (Cluster 1: mean [IQR] = 11.5- μ g/m³ [6.75, 14.5]; Cluster 2: 11.0- μ g/m³ [5.59, 14.1]), while participants in Cluster 3 (n = 735) had the lowest PM_{2.5} exposure levels overall (9.7- μ g/m³ [6.05, 12.5]) and a greater amount of variability in individuals' level of exposure to each component species. While clusters 1 and 2 were similar in regard to concentrations of OC, EC, and SO₄², cluster 1 had higher relative concentrations of NO₃ and NH⁴₄ (Fig. 2).

When considering tissue types individually, among all participants, a $5-\mu g/m^3$ increase in PM_{2.5} was associated with a lower proportion of stroma tissue ($\beta = -0.95$, 95% confidence interval (CI): -1.54- -0.35) and, given that stroma and adipose proportion were perfectly negatively correlated (Pearson's r = -1.0; Supplemental Table 1), we also observed a positive association between PM_{2.5} and adipose tissue proportion ($\beta = 0.77$, 95% CI: 0.35, 1.19). Neither association meaningfully differed by menopause status or cluster group (Table 2).

Overall, we observed a positive but statistically non-significant association between a $5-\mu g/m^3$ increase in PM_{2.5} and square roottransformed %ESP ($\beta = 0.23$, 95% CI: -0.17, 0.63; Table 2). The association did not differ by menopause status (p-interaction = 0.81), but there was significant heterogeneity when considering the association by $PM_{2.5}$ component clusters (*p*-interaction = 0.04). Higher residential levels of PM2.5 were associated with greater %ESP in an urban, Midwestern cluster with higher relative concentrations of NO₃ and NH₄⁺ (Cluster 1: $\beta = 0.48$, 95% CI: 0.02, 0.94). Among participants living in urban areas outside of the Midwest with lower relative concentrations of SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ , we observed an inverse but imprecise association with % ESP (Cluster 3: $\beta = -0.32$, 95% CI: -1.02, 0.37), whereas the association was negligible among a more suburban cluster comprised of individuals living primarily in the Midwest and South (Cluster 2: $\beta = 0.04$, 95% CI: -0.54, 0.62; Table 2). Regarding the proportion of epithelial tissue, we observed an inverse association with $PM_{2.5}$ within cluster 3 ($\beta = -0.58$, 95% CI: -0.98, -0.19) and null associations within cluster 1 ($\beta = -0.05$,



Fig. 1. Map of participant residential locations by $PM_{2.5}$ component cluster group, Komen Tissue Bank, 2009–2019 (N = 3,977). Locations of residences in states in which <5 participants reside are suppressed.



Fig. 2. Distribution of PM_{2.5} component species by cluster group.

Table 2

Model coefficients and 95% confidence intervals for the change in breast tissue composition (square root-transformed continuous proportions of epithelium, stroma, and adipose, or proportion epithelium relative to epithelium + stroma) per 5-ug/m³ increase in $PM_{2.5}$.

		β (95% Confidence Interval)				
PM _{2.5} total mass ^a	Ν	Epithelium (%)	Stroma (%)	Adipose (%)	ESP (%) ^b	
Overall	3,977	-0.12	-0.95	0.77	0.23	
		(-0.34, 0.11)	(-1.54, -0.35)	(0.35, 1.19)	(-0.17, 0.63)	
Component Cluster						
Cluster 1	2,866	-0.05	-1.15	0.91	0.48	
		(-0.31, 0.21)	(-1.83, -0.46)	(0.43, 1.39)	(0.02, 0.94)	
Cluster 2	735	-0.14	-1.38	0.99	0.04	
		(-0.47, 0.19)	(-2.25, -0.52)	(0.38, 1.6)	(-0.54, 0.62)	
Cluster 3	376	-0.58	-1.84	1.45	-0.32	
		(-0.98, -0.19)	(-2.88, -0.8)	(0.72, 2.19)	(-1.02, 0.37)	
p for interaction		0.04	0.43	0.38	0.04	
Menopause Status						
Premenopausal	2,610	-0.15	-1.11	0.89	0.2	
		(-0.38, 0.09)	(-1.74, -0.47)	(0.45, 1.34)	(-0.22, 0.62)	
Postmenopausal	1,367	-0.1	-0.71	0.59	0.24	
		(-0.36, 0.15)	(-1.39, -0.03)	(0.11, 1.07)	(-0.21, 0.7)	
p for interaction		0.65	0.14	0.11	0.81	

Note: ESP, epithelium-to-stroma proportion. Models are adjusted for age at donation, race/ethnicity, education, body

mass index (continuous), smoking status, donation year, census region, %adipose tissue area (%ESP models only).

 $^{a}PM_{2.5}$ total mass concentrations (μ g/m³) estimated by the EPA EQUATES model and assigned according to year of tissue

donation ${}^{b}n = 5$ missing ESP

95% CI: -0.31, 0.21) and cluster 2 (β = -0.14, 95% CI: -0.47, 0.19; *p*-interaction = 0.04; Table 2).

The associations between a 1-ug/m³ increase in PM_{2.5} component species and the square root-transformed proportion each tissue metric are presented in Supplemental Table 2. The magnitude and direction of associations for each tissue metric were not consistent across PM_{2.5} component species. Compared to associations with total PM_{2.5} mass, we observed similar associations for NH⁴₄ and OC with % epithelium and SO⁴₄ and OC with % stroma.

The associations stratified according to BMI categories and parity are presented in Supplemental Table 2. Across categories of BMI (i.e., <25, 25-<30, and ≥30 kg/m²), the direction of associations between PM_{2.5}

and each tissue metric were consistent overall. There was a significant interaction between $PM_{2.5}$ and BMI in relation to the proportion of epithelial and stromal tissue area (*p*-interaction = 0.04 and 0.05, respectively) but not in relation to the proportion of adipose tissue area or %ESP (*p*-interaction = 0.30 and 0.89, respectively). Among participants with a BMI < 25 kg/m³ and \geq 30 kg/m³, the magnitude of the association between $PM_{2.5}$ and % stroma was more pronounced compared to the overall association (<25 kg/m²: β = -1.08, 95% CI: -1.76, -0.39 and \geq 30 kg/m²: β = -1.26, 95% CI: -1.99, -0.53), and among overweight participants (BMI > 30), the association was smaller in magnitude and not statistically significant (β = -0.53, 95% CI: -1.21, 0.15). Although there was a significant interaction observed in relation

to the proportion of epithelial tissue, none of the associations within strata of BMI were statistically significant. Findings did not substantially differ according to parity, nor did they meaningfully change when adjusting for area-level factors or reproductive history (Supplemental Table 2). Further, we observed similar results when assigning exposure based on 2009 PM_{2.5} concentrations and when restricting the analysis to never smokers (Supplemental Table 2).

4. Discussion

In this cross-sectional study of breast cancer-free individuals who donated breast tissue, we observed that participants with higher residential levels of fine particulate matter were more likely to have breast tissue characterized by a lower proportion of stromal tissue. Further, among those with residential $PM_{2.5}$ with greater relative concentrations of nitrogenous compounds, $PM_{2.5}$ levels were positively associated with epithelium-to-stroma proportion. Elevated ESP has been suggested as an early marker of breast cancer risk among BBD patients. Thus, our findings relating $PM_{2.5}$ to histologic composition of the normal breast may inform early carcinogenic mechanisms by which air pollution influences breast cancer risk. Our findings also highlight the continued need to consider the variability in $PM_{2.5}$ chemical composition in relation to breast cancer-related outcomes.

 $PM_{2.5}$ is a heterogenous mixture comprised of diverse chemical components, including those with both carcinogenic and endocrine disrupting properties. In addition to the five components species considered in our analysis, $PM_{2.5}$ contains compounds with demonstrated estrogenic effects, including metals and PAHs (Choe et al. 2003; Santodonato 1997). While these compounds account for a relatively small proportion of $PM_{2.5}$, they can exert adverse effects even at low levels of exposure. Experimental evidence suggests that tissue organization and the cross talk between epithelial and stromal tissue—important for maintaining constraints on epithelial proliferation (Maffini et al. 2004; Rønnov-Jessen et al. 1996)—is sensitive to exogenous compounds with endocrine disrupting properties (Burks et al. 2017; Macon and Fenton 2013).

Among individuals with benign breast disease, researchers have observed that the proportion or ratio of epithelium-to-stroma was more strongly associated with subsequent invasive breast cancer risk than the proportion of epithelium alone. Vellal et al. (2021) found that a 10-fold increase in the ratio of epithelium to stroma was associated with approximately 30% higher odds of developing breast cancer (OR = 1.29, 95% CI: 1.05, 1.59). Similarly, Abubakar et al. (2021) found that women in the highest quartile of histologic-ESP had two times the odds of developing breast cancer relative to women in the lowest quartile, suggesting that high ESP is a feature of breast tissue composition that is conducive for epithelial proliferation and tumor initiation. Further, an increasing proportion of stromal tissue was associated with reduced breast cancer risk, particularly in the context of non-proliferative BBD (Abubakar et al. 2021), suggesting that the stroma has a protective effect against breast carcinogenesis during normal homeostasis and that stromal depletion may be one mechanism leading to increased ESP. Future work is needed to replicate these findings among individuals without a history of breast disease. While our results suggest that PM2.5 exposure is associated with differential histology of the breast, it is not yet clear whether a certain threshold in the proportion of stromal tissue or ESP is most influential for future breast cancer risk. However, we do note that the magnitude of the associations observed here between PM2.5 and ESP is comparable to that observed for established breast cancer risk factors such as elevated BMI and breastfeeding history (Abubakar et al. 2023). Thus, our findings of decreased proportion of stromal tissue and greater ESP among individuals with higher residential levels of PM2.5 suggests that a plausible pathway by which PM2.5 influences breast cancer risk is through contributing to stromal depletion and a concomitant increase in ESP.

Our findings build upon previous work conducted in a subset of participants in the Komen Tissue Bank in which increasing concentrations of residential PM2.5 exposure was associated with higher TLDU count. Given that TLDU involution is reflective of a reduction in the amount of epithelial tissue on BBD biopsies (Abubakar et al. 2021), higher TDLU count may reflect a greater amount of epithelium that is susceptible to carcinogenesis. In this previous work, Niehoff et al. (2020) examined tissue samples from a subset of Komen Tissue Bank who enrolled between 2009 and 2011. Given the labor-intensive nature of TDLU assessment, TDLU involution metrics were not available for all donors in our sample of participants enrolled up to 2019, and we were thus unable to replicate these previous findings. Nonetheless, our analysis utilizing machine learning-based methods more amenable to larger scale studies provides additional support that fine particulate matter air pollution may influence breast histologic characteristics in this larger population. This was particularly evident among individuals living in urban centers in the Midwest for whom ammonium and nitrate particles contributed to a greater proportion of residential PM_{2.5} exposure. We note, however, that the present analysis and the study by Niehoff et al. (2020) are cross-sectional. Future research is needed to prospectively the examine the association between air pollution exposures and breast tissue composition.

Although our study is the first to examine quantitative histologic breast tissue composition in relation to particulate matter air pollution, our findings can be discussed in the context of previous work investigating PM2.5 and mammographic density. Positive associations have been observed with categorical measures of breast density in relation to ambient PM_{2.5} (Yaghjyan et al. 2017) and specific air toxics that are constituents of PM_{2.5} (White et al. 2019c). Among participants 40 years or older in the Breast Cancer Surveillance Consortium (n = 279,967, 2001-2009), Yaghjyan et al. (2017) reported that compared to individuals with scattered fibroglandular breasts, those with heterogeneously dense breast had higher exposure to PM2.5 (fourth vs. first quartile odds ratio (OR) = 1.19, 95% CI: 1.16, 1.23). In the same study population, White et al. (2019c) found residential exposure to the airborne heavy metals arsenic, cobalt, lead, manganese, and nickel, both singly and in combination, was associated with greater breast density. Unlike mammographic density, the histologic tissue metrics used in our analysis distinguish between relative amounts of epithelial and stromal tissue. Thus, our findings complement the literature related to breast density and provide additional insight into potential biologic pathways through which air pollution may influence breast tissue composition and subsequent breast cancer risk. Notably, Abubakar et al. (2021) found that ESP and mammographic density were independent and jointly associated with breast cancer incidence. A potential direction for future research would be to examine the association between air pollution and combined measures of breast density and ESP.

In contrast to findings for NO2, studies for PM2.5 and breast cancer risk have been more inconsistent with few considering the role of PM_{2.5} components (Andersen et al. 2017b; White et al., 2019a) or geographic heterogeneity in PM_{2.5} (White et al. 2021; White et al., 2019a). Findings from two large, prospective US-wide cohorts highlight the importance of geographic heterogeneity in $PM_{2.5}$ in relation to breast cancer. In the Black Women's Health Study, increased risk of negative estrogen receptor status (ER-) breast cancer and premenopausal breast cancer was found only among participants in the Midwest (White et al. 2021). In the Sister Study, a cohort of women with a sister with breast cancer who themselves are cancer-free at baseline, White et al. (2019a) observed that higher residential levels of PM2.5 were associated with greater incidence of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) breast cancer among participants in the Midwest and a greater incidence of invasive breast cancer among participants in the Western US. Similarly, in the Nurses' Health Study, a prospective cohort of female US nurses established in 1976, DuPre et al. (2017) found no overall association between PM_{2.5} and a continuous measure of mammographic density although a positive association was suggested among women living in the Northeast (β = 3.9% per 10-µg/m³ increase in PM_{2.5}, 95% CI: -0.02, 7.9).

The relative distribution of PM2.5 constituent species are known to vary by geographic regions due to different PM2.5 sources (Bell et al. 2007) and thus could contribute to geographic heterogeneity in breast cancer risk. In our study, we identified a Midwest-based cluster (cluster 1) capturing participants living in urban areas among whom we observed a positive association between PM2.5 total mass and %ESP. The profile of PM2.5 component species may be indicative of PM2.5 sources giving rise to the higher proportions of ammonium and nitrate observed within this cluster. For example, in addition to fossil fuel combustion, agricultural activity is a major source of ammonia emissions and the subsequent formation of nitrate and ammonium particles (Kundu and Stone 2014). However, the associations between levels of each individual PM2.5 component species and %ESP does not support the hypothesis that any single component is driving the association with PM_{2.5} total mass. While the five components considered in our analysis together comprise the majority of PM_{2.5} total mass, it is possible that the PM_{2.5} component clusters we identified are proxies of unmeasured components or other air pollutants relevant to effects on the breast. For example, compared to other census regions, the Midwest generally has higher levels of industrial emissions. Monitoring data suggests that PM_{2.5} in the Midwest is comprised of higher levels of heavy metals, including cadmium, vanadium, arsenic, and cobalt (Keller et al. 2017), and higher levels of exposure to these toxic air pollutants have been associated with increased breast density (White et al. 2019c) and breast cancer incidence (Andersen et al. 2017b; White et al. 2019b).

Contrary to our hypothesis, residential PM2.5 was inversely, but imprecisely, associated with %ESP and the proportion of epithelial tissue among participants assigned to cluster 3. PM_{2.5} exposure within this cluster can be characterized as having lower proportion of sulfate particles which may indicate fewer emissions from fossil fuel combustion including those from coal-burning power plants (Bell et al. 2007). However, one of the most defining features of cluster 3 was that it was comprised of a limited number of individuals living outside of the Midwestern US, including participants in both Southern California and New York. Given that areas on the West and East coast have different air pollution profiles (Bell et al. 2007), cluster 3 is characterized by greater heterogeneity in the levels of each PM2.5 component species compared to the other clusters, as shown in Fig. 2. Thus, it is unclear whether cluster 3 represents a meaningful profile of PM2.5 chemical composition and whether any true associations may be obscured given the heterogeneity within the cluster.

The findings of this study should be interpreted considering the strengths and limitations of our exposure assessment methods. The use of high-quality air pollution data estimated using the ESCAPE model-a technique integrating robust modeling procedures with air pollution measurements-is an important strength of our study. Also, using modelled estimates of PM2.5 component species allowed us to consider the impact of heterogeneity in PM2.5 chemical composition. Although we assigned 2009 levels of component species to all participants regardless of donation year, the relative composition of PM_{2.5} was stable during the study period. In addition, we estimated annual concentrations of PM2.5 based on participants' home residence, which does not capture indoor air pollution nor time spent away from the home that could impact their exposure. We expect resulting misclassification of exposure, however, to be non-differential with respect to breast tissue composition. Importantly, we did not have information on how long participants had lived at their address reported at the time of tissue donation or information on past residences. Thus, we were not able to evaluate long-term air pollution exposure or exposure during potentially sensitive periods in which changes in breast composition may be vulnerable to air pollution, for example, during fetal development, puberty, or pregnancy (Terry et al. 2019). Current breast tissue composition may more strongly reflect the development and remodeling of the breast during these periods rather than the influence of more recent

exposures. Yet recent exposures may still have an important impact; observational studies have demonstrated breast density declines after discontinuation of hormone replacement therapy or tamoxifen use (Chow et al. 2000; Cuzick et al. 2004; Rutter 2001), highlighting the potential modifiability of this breast cancer risk factor even later in life.

Our study leveraged objective and novel quantitative histologic tissue composition metrics among a unique resource of tissue samples from individuals without a personal history of breast cancer. Given that the procedure for collection of breast tissue cores was non-targeted, we cannot rule out the possibility of non-representative sampling of breast tissue and the influence of random error in our effect estimates. However, analyzing tissue component measures as a percentage of the total tissue area helps address this limitation. Additionally, we recognize that applying a square root transformation to the outcome measurements can add difficulty in interpreting the effect estimates. However, regardless of any transformation applied to the tissue metrics, the magnitude of the effect estimates can change depending on the distribution of the tissue metrics in a given population. Thus, we emphasize the direction rather than the magnitude of the observed associations. Given regional differences in obesity (Myers et al. 2015), which is reflected by differences between clusters in the percent adipose tissue in breast tissue samples among our study population, we cannot rule out residual confounding by BMI or adiposity. We sought to minimize this concern by controlling for a continuous measure of BMI and in models examining %ESP, controlling for the proportion of adipose tissue on the slide. We also found limited evidence that associations between PM2.5 and tissue composition meaningfully differed by BMI categories. Lastly, the generalizability of our findings may be limited given that participants donated to the Komen Tissue Bank on a volunteer basis and most resided in the Midwestern US, which limited our ability to explore PM2.5 component profiles outside of the Midwest.

In conclusion, we observed that higher residential exposure to fine particulate matter with greater relative proportions of nitrogenous compounds was associated with breast histologic characteristics that are indicative of a higher underlying breast cancer risk. Thus, our findings support the possible role of $PM_{2.5}$ in breast cancer etiology and suggest that breast tissue composition may be a potential pathway by which outdoor air pollution impacts breast cancer risk.

Funding: This research was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences Z01-ES103332.

Data statement: Requests for Komen Tissue Bank data, including the data used in this manuscript, can be requested through the study website (https:// komentissuebank.iu.edu/researchers/).

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Jennifer L. Ish: Formal analysis, Writing – original draft. Mustapha Abubakar: Investigation, Writing – review & editing. Shaoqi Fan: Data curation, Methodology. Rena R. Jones: Writing – review & editing. Nicole M. Niehoff: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Writing – review & editing. Jill E. Henry: Resources. Gretchen L. Gierach: Writing – review & editing. Alexandra J. White: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing, Funding acquisition.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

Requests for Komen Tissue Bank data, including the data used in this manuscript, can be requested through the study website (https://komentissuebank.iu.edu/researchers/).

Environment International 176 (2023) 107984

Appendix A. Supplementary material

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2023.107984.

References

- Abubakar, M., Klein, A., Fan, S., Lawrence, S., Mutreja, K., Henry, J.E., Pfeiffer, R.M., Duggan, M.A., Gierach, G.L., 2023. Host, reproductive, and lifestyle factors in relation to quantitative histologic metrics of the normal breast. PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square 2023.
- Abubakar, M., Fan, S., Bowles, E.A., Widemann, L., Duggan, M.A., Pfeiffer, R.M., Falk, R. T., Lawrence, S., Richert-Boe, K., Glass, A.G., Kimes, T.M., Figueroa, J.D., Rohan, T. E., Gierach, G.L., 2021. Relation of quantitative histologic and radiologic breast tissue composition metrics with invasive breast cancer risk. JNCI Can. Spectr 5, pkab015.

Andersen, Z.J., Ravnskjær, L., Andersen, K.K., Loft, S., Brandt, J., Becker, T., Ketzel, M., Hertel, O., Lynge, E., Bräuner, E.V., 2017a. Long-term exposure to fine particulate matter and breast cancer incidence in the danish nurse Cohort study. Can. Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. 26, 428–430.

- Andersen, Z.J., Stafoggia, M., Weinmayr, G., Pedersen, M., Galassi, C., Jørgensen, J.T., Oudin, A., Forsberg, B., Olsson, D., Oftedal, B., Aasvang, G.M., Aamodt, G., Pyko, A., Pershagen, G., Korek, M., De Faire, U., Pedersen, N.L., Östenson, C.-G., Fratiglioni, L., Eriksen, K.T., Tjønneland, A., Peeters, P.H., Bueno-de-Mesquita, B., Plusquin, M., Key, T.J., Jaensch, A., Nagel, G., Lang, A., Wang, M., Tsai, M.-Y., Fournier, A., Boutron-Ruault, M.-C., Baglietto, L., Grioni, S., Marcon, A., Krogh, V., Ricceri, F., Sacerdote, C., Migliore, E., Tamayo-Uria, I., Amiano, P., Dorronsoro, M., Vermeulen, R., Sokhi, R., Keuken, M., de Hoogh, K., Beelen, R., Vineis, P., Cesaroni, G., Brunekreef, B., Hoek, G., Raaschou-Nielsen, O., 2017b. Long-term exposure to ambient air pollution and incidence of postmenopausal breast cancer in 15 European cohorts within the ESCAPE project. Environ. Health Perspect. 125, 107005.
- Bell, M.L., Dominici, F., Ebisu, K., Zeger, S.L., Samet, J.M., 2007. Spatial and temporal variation in PM(2.5) chemical composition in the United States for health effects studies. Environ. Health Perspect. 115, 989–995.
- Burks, H., Pashos, N., Martin, E., McLachlan, J., Bunnell, B., Burow, M., 2017. Endocrine disruptors and the tumor microenvironment: a new paradigm in breast cancer biology. Mol. Cell. Endocrinol. 457, 13–19.
- Cheng, J., Yong, C., Wu, J., Yang, J., Conroy, S.M., Shariff-Marco, S., Li, L., Hertz, A., Gomez, S.L., Le Marchand, L., Whittemore, A.S., Stram, D.O., Ritz, B., Wu, A.H., 2020. Association between ambient air pollution and breast cancer risk: the multiethnic cohort study. Int. J. Cancer 146, 699–711.
- Choe, S.-Y., Kim, S.-J., Kim, H.-G., Lee, J.H., Choi, Y., Lee, H., Kim, Y., 2003. Evaluation of estrogenicity of major heavy metals. Sci. Total Environ. 312, 15–21.
- Chow, C.K., Venzon, D., Jones, E.C., Premkumar, A., O'Shaughnessy, J., Zujewski, J., 2000. Effect of tamoxifen on mammographic density. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 9, 917–921.
- Cuzick, J., Warwick, J., Pinney, E., Warren, R.M.L., Duffy, S.W., 2004. Tamoxifen and breast density in women at increased risk of breast cancer. J. Natl Cancer Inst. 96, 621–628.
- Datzmann, T., Markevych, I., Trautmann, F., Heinrich, J., Schmitt, J., Tesch, F., 2018. Outdoor air pollution, green space, and cancer incidence in Saxony: a semiindividual cohort study. BMC Public Health 18, 715.
- DuPre, N.C., Hart, J.E., Bertrand, K.A., Kraft, P., Laden, F., Tamimi, R.M., 2017. Residential particulate matter and distance to roadways in relation to mammographic density: results from the Nurses' Health Studies. Breast Cancer Res. 19, 124.
- Figueroa, J.D., Pfeiffer, R.M., Patel, D.A., Linville, L., Brinton, L.A., Gierach, G.L., Yang, X.R., Papathomas, D., Visscher, D., Mies, C., Degnim, A.C., Anderson, W.F., Hewitt, S., Khodr, Z.G., Clare, S.E., Storniolo, A.M., Sherman, M.E., 2014. Terminal duct lobular unit involution of the normal breast: implications for breast cancer
- etiology. J. Natl Cancer Inst. 106, dju286. Gabet, S., Lemarchand, C., Guénel, P., Slama, R., 2021. Breast cancer risk in association with atmospheric pollution exposure: a meta-analysis of effect estimates followed by a health impact assessment. Environ. Health Perspect. 129, 57012.
- Gibson, E.A., Nunez, Y., Abuawad, A., Zota, A.R., Renzetti, S., Devick, K.L., Gennings, C., Goldsmith, J., Coull, B.A., Kioumourtzoglou, M.-A., 2019. An overview of methods to address distinct research questions on environmental mixtures: an application to persistent organic pollutants and leukocyte telomere length. Environ. Health 18, 76.
- Greenland, S., Pearl, J., Robins, J.M., 1999. Causal diagrams for epidemiologic research. Epidemiology 10, 37–48.
 Hart, J.E., Bertrand, K.A., DuPre, N., James, P., Vieira, V.M., Tamimi, R.M., Laden, F.,
- 2016. Long-term particulate matter exposures during adulthood and risk of breast

cancer incidence in the nurses' health study II prospective cohort. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 25, 1274–1276.

Hubert, L., Arabie, P., 1985. Comparing partitions. J. Classif. 2, 193-218.

- Huynh, S., von Euler-Chelpin, M., Raaschou-Nielsen, O., Hertel, O., Tjønneland, A., Lynge, E., Vejborg, I., Andersen, Z.J., 2015. Long-term exposure to air pollution and mammographic density in the Danish Diet, Cancer and Health cohort. Environ. Health 14, 31.
- Keller, J.P., Drton, M., Larson, T., Kaufman, J.D., Sandler, D.P., Szpiro, A.A., 2017. Covariate-adaptive clutering of exposures for air pollution epidemiology cohorts. Ann Appl Stat 11, 93–113.
- Kundu, S., Stone, E.A., 2014. Composition and sources of fine particulate matter across urban and rural sites in the Midwestern United States. Environ. Sci Process Impacts 16, 1360–1370.
- Macon, M.B., Fenton, S.E., 2013. Endocrine disruptors and the breast: early life effects and later life disease. J Mammary Gland Biol Neoplasia 18, 43–61.
- Maffini, M.V., Soto, A.M., Calabro, J.M., Ucci, A.A., Sonnenschein, C., 2004. The stroma as a crucial target in rat mammary gland carcinogenesis. J Cell Sci 117, 1495–1502.
- Milanese, T.R., Hartmann, L.C., Sellers, T.A., Frost, M.H., Vierkant, R.A., Maloney, S.D., Pankratz, V.S., Degnim, A.C., Vachon, C.M., Reynolds, C.A., Thompson, R.A., Melton, L.J., Goode, E.L., Visscher, D.W., 2006. Age-related lobular involution and risk of breast cancer. J. Natl Cancer Inst. 98, 1600–1607.
- Myers, C.A., Slack, T., Martin, C.K., Broyles, S.T., Heymsfield, S.B., 2015. Regional disparities in obesity prevalence in the United States: a spatial regime analysis. Obesity 23, 481–487.
- Nazari, S.S., Mukherjee, P., 2018. An overview of mammographic density and its association with breast cancer. Breast Cancer 25, 259–267.
- Niehoff, N.M., Gammon, M.D., Keil, A.P., Nichols, H.B., Engel, L.S., Sandler, D.P., White, A.J., 2019. Airborne mammary carcinogens and breast cancer risk in the Sister Study. Environ. Int. 130, 104897.
- Niehoff, N.M., Keil, A.P., Jones, R.R., Fan, S., Gierach, G.L., White, A.J., 2020. Outdoor air pollution and terminal duct lobular involution of the normal breast. Breast Can. Res 22, 100.
- Reding, K.W., Young, M.T., Szpiro, A.A., Han, C.J., DeRoo, L.A., Weinberg, C., Kaufman, J.D., Sandler, D.P., 2015. Breast cancer risk in relation to ambient air pollution exposure at residences in the sister study cohort. Can. Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. 24, 1907–1909.
- Rønnov-Jessen, L., Petersen, O.W., Bissell, M.J., 1996. Cellular changes involved in conversion of normal to malignant breast: importance of the stromal reaction. Physiol. Rev 76, 69–125.
- Russo, J., Hu, Y.F., Yang, X., Russo, I.H., 2000. Chapter 1: Developmental, Cellular, and Molecular Basis of Human Breast Cancer. JNCI Monographs 2000;2000:17-37.
- Rutter, C.M., 2001. Changes in breast density associated with initiation, discontinuation, and continuing use of hormone replacement therapy. J. Am. Med. Assoc. 285, 171. Santodonato, J., 1997. Review of the estrogenic and antiestrogenic activity of polycyclic
- aromatic hydrocarbons: relationship to carcinogenic and anticity. Chemosphere 34, 835–848.
- Terry, M.B., Michels, K.B., Brody, J.G., Byrne, C., Chen, S., Jerry, D.J., Malecki, K.M.C., Martin, M.B., Miller, R.L., Neuhausen, S.L., Silk, K., Trentham-Dietz, A., 2019. on behalf of Breast Cancer the Environment Research Program, 2019. Environmental exposures during windows of susceptibility for breast cancer: a framework for prevention research. Breast Cancer Res 21, 96.
- US Environmental Protection Agency. EQUATES CMAQv5.3.2 output (version 1.0) [data file and documentation]. 2021.
- Vellal, A.D., Sirinukunwattan, K., Kensler, K.H., Baker, G.M., Stancu, A.L., Pyle, M.E., Collins, L.C., Schnitt, S.J., Connolly, J.L., Veta, M., Eliassen, A.H., Tamimi, R.M., Heng, Y.J., 2021. Deep learning image analysis of benign breast disease to identify subsequent risk of breast cancer. JNCI Cancer Spectr 5.

Villeneuve, P.J., Goldberg, M.S., Crouse, D.L., To, T., Weichenthal, S.A., Wall, C., Miller, A.B., 2018. Residential exposure to fine particulate matter air pollution and incident breast cancer in a cohort of Canadian women. Environ. Epidemiol. 2, e021.

- White, A.J., Bradshaw, P.T., Hamra, G.B., 2018. Air pollution and Breast cancer: a review. Curr. Epidemiol. Rep. 5, 92–100.
- White, A.J., Keller, J.P., Zhao, S., Carroll, R., Kaufman, J.D., Sandler, D.P., 2019. Air pollution, clustering of particulate matter components, and breast cancer in the sister study: A U.S.-Wide Cohort. Environ. Health Perspect., 107002
- White, A.J., O'Brien, K.M., Niehoff, N.M., Carroll, R., Sandler, D.P., 2019b. Metallic air pollutants and breast cancer risk in a nationwide cohort study. Epidemiology 30, 20–28.
- White, A.J., Weinberg, C.R., O'Meara, E.S., Sandler, D.P., Sprague, B.L., 2019c. Airborne metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in relation to mammographic breast density. Breast Can. Res. 21, 24.
- White, A.J., Gregoire, A.M., Niehoff, N.M., Bertrand, K.A., Palmer, J.R., Coogan, P.F., Bethea, T.N., 2021. Air pollution and breast cancer risk in the Black Women's Health Study. Environ. Res. 194, 110651.
- Yaghjyan, L., Arao, R., Brokamp, C., O'Meara, E.S., Sprague, B.L., Ghita, G., Ryan, P., 2017. Association between air pollution and mammographic breast density in the Breast Cancer Surveilance Consortium. Breast Can. Res. 19, 36.